

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

REMARKS

MAY 08 2007

I. General:

Applicants respectfully request that the attorney docket number associated with this application be changed from 6032/093 to 36032/093.

II. Comments on the Restriction Requirement:

According to the Examiner, apparatus claims 1-8 and process claims 9-12 are properly restricted because the process claims can be practiced by hand or used to inflate a child's toy. Applicants hereby elect the methods of inflating and launching a balloon as recited in claims 9-12; however, for at least the reasons that follow, Applicants traverse the restriction requirement.

Examiners must provide reasons for requiring restriction. M.P.E.P. § 808.01. For at least the reasons that follow, Applicants respectfully contends that the Examiner's reasons do not support restricting the present application.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's contention that the processes recited in claims 9-12 can be practiced by hand. As the form paragraph in M.P.E.P. § 806.05(e) provides, "[a] process can be practiced by hand if it can be performed without using any apparatus." Whereas a process practiced by hand is performed without using any apparatus, the processes recited in claims 9-12 explicitly recite structural devices used in the process of "inflating and launching a balloon". In particular, claim 9 recites a "launch platform" and a "launch bag". Since the foregoing structures or equivalent structures are used to practice the processes recited therein, Applicant respectfully submits that the processes cannot be practiced by hand.

With respect to the Examiner's contention that the process claims "can be used to inflate a child's toy", Applicant respectfully points out that the apparatuses recited in claims 1-8 could also be used to inflate a child's toy. The apparatus claims simply do not recite any elements that preclude such a use. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing observation in no way justifies the aforementioned restriction requirement.

III. Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

Dated: May 8, 2007

Michael Pruden

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Michael Pruden, Reg. No. 52,135

Ollila Law Group, L.L.C.

Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 22

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995